## REMARKS

The Office Action dated April 19, 2006 and subsequent Advisory Action dated August 3, 2006 have been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claim 9 is amended to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the present invention. Support for the amendment is found at least in paragraph [0033] of the specification. Claims 14 and 15 are added. No new matter is added. Claims 7-15 are respectfully submitted for consideration.

The Office Action rejected claims 9-13 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph for failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully submit that the features recited in claim 9 fully comply with the written description requirement. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9-13 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 7-13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,400,803 to Tate et al. (Tate). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7, from which claim 8 depends, is directed to a DSL suppression circuit for suppressing DSL mode operation on a local loop. The circuit includes a loop current detector for sensing current drain on the local loop. The suppression circuit further includes a means for providing a suppression signal controllable by said loop current detector. The suppression circuit further includes a master DSL modem operatively

coupled to a subscriber line interference circuit (SLIC), said master DSL modem operating in a quiescent state upon receiving the suppression signal, wherein the SLIC provides power to a subscriber line during the quiescent state.

Claim 9, from which claims 10-13 depend, is directed to a method for providing a customer premise line connection to a DSL modem. The method includes, detecting whether a line has an off-hook condition or an on-hook condition. The method further includes energizing a relay is energized to couple the line to a DSL modem, wherein the line has the on-hook condition. A switching means is activated for bypassing the DSL modem during a quiescent state upon the DSL modem receiving a suppression signal.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims recited features that are neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited reference.

Tate relates to a voiceover digital subscriber line call redirection for lifeline service. Tate describes, under a fault condition, a router that directs an incoming call to a selected port to provide a lifeline service. The router is arranged to monitor signals received at a subscriber loop port and selectively to disconnect at least one of the local subscriber ports responsive to signals. Referring to Figure 3 of Tate, a lifeline router 320 is arranged to receive signals passing between switch 301 and switches 331-334 and to provide output signals on outputs 321-324 that provide control signals to switches 331-334, respectively. Upon a loss of local power, switches 301 and 331-334 are arranged to default to provide a direct connection from subscriber loop port 340 via the direct link to switches 331-334 and to local subscriber ports 351-354. In lifeline mode, only one

channel can be supported between the subscriber loop port and one of the local subscriber ports. Further, lifeline router 320 is used to receive redirection signals from a local exchange via subscriber loop port 340, whereby the control switches 331-334 provide local routing within customer premises equipment.

Applicants respectfully submit that Tate fails to disclose or suggest at least the feature of a master DSL modem operative coupled to a subscriber line interference circuit (SLIC), said master DSL modem operating in a quiescent state upon receiving the suppression signal, wherein the SLIC provides power to a subscriber line during the quiescent state, as recited in claim 7 and similarly recited in claim 9.

In the Response to Arguments section, the Office Action asserted that Tate discloses the feature of said master DSL modem operating in a quiescent state upon receiving the suppression signal as recited in claims 7 and 9. However, Tate merely discloses in Figure 3 and column 4 lines 37-45, that the "[l]ifeline router 320 is arranged to receive the signal passing between switch 301 and switches 331-4 which provide control signals to switches 331-4 respectively." As clearly shown in Figure 3 of Tate, the DSL modem 310 only receives a signal from switch 301. Switch 301 operates to bypass the DSL modem 310 to provide a connection between the port 340 and the output switches 331-4. The Office Action, on page 6, alleges that a "suppression" signal is received/detected and provided to the DSL modem in CPE 300 (via Mux 13) from the local exchange. Thus, the Office Action appears to assert that the DSL modem inherently receives a "suppression" signal because of the signal received by the CPE 300 to

enter/exit the lifeline mode. However, this feature is not disclosed, suggested, or inherent in Tate. Thus, it appears that the Office Action is inappropriately reading features into Tate. Instead, the DSL modem in Tate is passively taken off-line in the event of power loss by activating switch 301 and redirecting the signal to the lifeline router 320. See also Tate column 5 lines 18-21. As clearly described in the specification of the present application at least in paragraph [0033] and recited in claims 7 and 9, the DSL modem receives the suppression signal and upon doing so, enters the quiescent state.

Applicants respectfully submit that because claims 8 and 10-13 depend from claims 7 and 9 respectively, these claims are allowable at least for the same reasons as claims 7 and 9, as well as for the additional features recited in these dependent claims.

Based at least on the above, Applicants respectfully submit that Tate fails to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in any of the pending claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is respectfully requested.

As stated above, new claims 14 and 15 are added. Applicants respectfully submit that each of claims 14 and 15 recite features that are neither disclosed nor suggested in any of the cited references.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that each of claims 7-15 be allowed, and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by

telephone, the applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,

David E. Brown
Registration No. 51,091

**Customer No. 32294**
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14$^{TH}$ Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700
Telephone: 703-720-7800
Fax: 703-720-7802

DEB:jkm

Enclosures: Petition for Extension of Time
Additional Claim Fee Transmittal
Request for Continued Examination (RCE) Transmittal
Check No. 14853